DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 859 SP 029 764

AUTHOR Ayers, Jerry B.; And Others
TITLE Institutional Needs and Teacher Education Program Evaluation. A Symposium.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 37p.; Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Mobile, AL, November 11-13, 1987). The work reported in this document was supported in part by a grant from the State of Tennessee through the Centers of Excellence program.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Evaluation Methods; *Evaluation Needs; *Evaluation Problems; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Needs Assessment; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

The papers presented at this symposium offer discussions on the program evaluation needs of three categories of teacher education institutions. An introductory paper examines state-of-the-art teacher education program evaluation, the requirements of national and regional accreditation agencies, and the evaluation requirements involved in the state approval of teacher education programs. The first paper focuses on the specific needs of small colleges, the constraints that are placed on such institutions (i.,e., resources and governance requirements), the need for help, and the need for systems that can be implemented with limited resources. The second paper deals with the evaluation problems of regional state universities, the constraints on the work that can be carried out by such institutions, and ways that the evaluation process can be improved. The third paper discusses the problems of large multi-purpose institutions. The papers are summarized and critiqued in a final paper which synthesizes the papers into the common and unique needs of the three types of institutions. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED289859

A SYMPOSIUM

INSTITUTIONAL NEEDS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION[1]

Organizer: Jerry B. Ayers,
Tennessee Technological University

Presenters: "The Need for Institutions to Conduct Teacher Education Evaluation."
Jerry B. Ayers,
Tennessee Technological University

"Small College Needs for Conducting Teacher Education Evaluation."
Paul A. Clark,
Milligan College

"Regional Universities' Needs for Conducting Teacher Education Evaluation: A Case study of Eastern Kentucky University."
J. Linward Doak
Eastern Kentucky University

"A Need for and the Role of Research Bureaus in Conducting Teacher Education Evaluation at Large Universities."
Arnold J. Moore,
Mississippi State University

Reactant: William J. Gephart
Tennessee Technological University

[1]A Symposium presented before the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile, Alabama, November, 1987. The activities reported herein were supported in part by the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation, Tennessee Technological University with assistance through the Centers of Excellence Program of the State of Tennessee.

SP 029 764

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. B. Ayers
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

INSTITUTIONAL NEEDS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

Recent legislative mandates, the conclusions of reform groups, and the intensified requirements of national, regional and state accreditation agencies have placed extensive pressures on the the 1,275 institutions, in this country which prepare teachers for grades K-12. These institutions are being charged with the responsibility to change and improve teacher education. The acceptance of this responsibility carries with the need for constant formative, summative, qualitative, and discrepancy evaluation.

Teacher educators need to carefully depict the quality of their efforts. As assessments are made, there is a need to delineate the discrepancy between what is known about quality teacher education and what is being done. As these efforts are undertaken, there is a need for carefully designed and conducted context evaluation mechanisms to help identify areas of deficiency and opportunities for improvement. Finally there is a need for rationally designed and tested improvement plans--the operational site for formative and summative evaluation.

What are the specific evaluation needs of the institutions of higher education that prepare teachers? There appears to be some evaluation needs that are common across the universe of teacher education programs. At the same time there are three fairly distinct categories of institutions which prepare teachers including: (1) large state or private, multi-purpose universibties; (2) regional state universities; and (3) small liberal arts colleges. These institutions, because of their size differences alone, have varying needs regarding teacher education evaluation. The Center for Teacher Education Evaluation at Tennessee Technological University has been specifically charged with the task of developing models and materials for use in the evaluation and improvement of teacher education programs. To make progress toward that mission the Center must know the needs that are common across the three categories of institutions and the teacher education program evaluation needs that are specific to each type institution.

These needs are the thrust of this symposium. The topic will be placed into perspective by the organizer (Ayers) with an introduction to the field of teacher education program evaluation, and the general needs across all institutions. This presentation will examine state-of-the-art teacher education program evaluation, the requirements of national and regional accreditation agencies, and the evaluation requirements involved in the state approval of teacher education programs. Three papers will will address the teacher education program evaluation needs particular to the three institutional categories.

Small colleges in the United States serve a very important function. Most of these institutions prepare teachers; however,

they have limited resources, both financial and in personnel. Few of them have faculty members knowledgeable of the evaluation process and its practice. Many times these college have difficulty in meeting the evaluation requirements of accreditation agencies. The needs of small colleges will be presented by the Chair of the Division of Education at a small church related school (Clark). The Center for Teacher Education has completed a survey of small colleges relative to their needs for program evaluation. Clark's presentation will focus on the results of the survey and will include specific needs of the small institutions, a discussion of the constraints that are placed on such institutions (i.,e., resources and governance requirements), the needs for help, and the need for systems that can be implemented with limited resources.

Regional state universities have problems that are quite different from small institutions and from the large multi-purpose institution. The needs of the regional universities or medium size colleges will be put in perspective by an individual who has long worked in the area (Doak). The paper will focus on such topics as the needs of such institutions for assistance in teacher education evaluation, the constraints on the work that can be carried out by the institutions, and ways that the evaluation process can be improved.

Large multi-purpose institutions have a different set of needs and constraints than the other types of institutions. They also frequently have an entity such as a Bureau of Research and Service that can be called on for assistance. The third presentation will focus on the evaluation needs of the larger institutions (Moore) and the way in which Bureaus are used to conduct the work. These institutions also have unique problems that must be solved in order to have adequate systems for evaluation. The presentation will also examine the needs for additional help and services in carrying out teacher education program evaluation.

The three papers presented will be summarized and critiqued in part by a member of the staff of the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation (Gephart). The purpose of this part of the program will be to synthesize the papers into the common and unique needs of the three types of institutions.

The audience will be given time to raise questions and to present specific needs for their type of institutions. The information gathered as a part of the symposium will be presented in the form of a paper to the staff and Advisory Board of the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation for use in the development research studies and fulfilling the needs of institutions of higher education in carrying out teacher education program evaluation.

THE NEED FOR INSTITUTIONS TO CONDUCT TEACHER EDUCATION EVALUATION[1]

Jerry B. Ayers
Center for Teacher Education Evaluation
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, TN 38505

> We report to the American people that while we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States and the well-being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people (National Commission, 1983).

The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) and some 50 other studies published in the last four years have examined in depth the problems of education in the United States. The nation is responding to the need to improve education at all levels (U. S. Dept. of Education, 1984). For example, in Tennessee, the **Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984** (CERA) provides an avenue that is leading to improvements in education at all levels. Virtually all of the states have passed in the last few years major legislation designed to improve education.

Right or wrong, much of the blame for the present condition of education in the nation has been placed on teacher education. Teacher education is in need of revision and reform. However, there is a paucity of knowledge about what the content of teacher education programs should be and about the relationship between preparation programs/knowledge base and effective teacher performance. In order to overcome the problems associated with teacher education reform there is a need for basic research and evaluation data by institutions preparing teachers.

Again, in Tennessee, the mandates of the **CERA** make it imperative that higher education develop better methods for the preparation of teachers and other personnel to work in the schools and to improve the quality of its programs. In order to develop and implement improved programs adequately for the preparation of teachers there is an urgent need to develop methods that will allow for objective evaluations of teacher education programs. J. T. Sandefur (1982), a leading authority

---

[1]Presented in part before the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile, AL, November, 1987. The work reported herein was supported in part by a grant from the State of Tennessee through the Centers of Excellence program.

on teacher education program evaluation, a Past-President of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and a past Chairman of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, pointed out that it is imperative that more work be conducted to develop

> ..... effective, functional systems that can be used to evaluate graduates of teacher preparation programs and to provide developmental feedback that can be used for program development and improvement.

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (1985) indicated that a major effort needs to be undertaken in the United States that builds "new strategies for ensuring the quality of education graduates." The final report of the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (NIE, 1984) posits three conditions for achieving excellence including student involvement, high expectations for post secondary education, and assessment and feedback. The Tennessee Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, in its publication Teacher Education Reform in Tennessee (Commission on Teacher Education Reform, December, 1985), identified several priorities for improving teacher education in Tennessee. Recommendation 28 states that

> Each institution which educates teachers should adopt an evaluation model for follow-up studies of its graduates and their performance.

It was pointed out in Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education (NIE, 1984) that a major condition for improving higher education in America is the development and implementation of improved assessment and feedback systems. Kilgore (1981), Savage (1981), Smith (1982) and Nelli and Nutter (1985) have all indicated a need for improved evaluation systems in order to enhance the preparation programs for teachers.

Throughout the United States there is an increasing demand that schools, colleges and departments of education (SCDEs) revise their programs based on evaluations of their programs and the products (graduates of the programs). Internal pressures encourage institutions to demonstrate program effectiveness, while external mandates for meeting accreditation standards reinforce the need to engage in systematic evaluation activities. Without well developed program assessment followed by systematic implementation of the changes warranted by the examination, it is difficult to imagine how continuous increases in program effectiveness can be attained.

The need to evaluate programs for the preparation of teachers and to followup the graduates has always existed, yet there has been a dearth of practical models and procedures for conducting the needed studies. For years, many institutions have

conducted very limited followup studies of their graduates. These studies have consisted largely of asking the graduates to indicate how well they were doing as teachers and requesting them to make suggestions for improvements in the teacher preparation programs they had completed. The need for institutions of higher education to evaluate their teacher education programs and graduates was given added emphasis when the 1970 Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education were adopted by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education Evaluation and was given even further emphasis in the 1986 revisions. For example Precondition 4, that must be met before an institution can be considered for accreditation states

> The unit keeps abreast of emerging evaluation techniques and regularly monitors and evaluates, both internally and externally, its operation, scope, quality of its offerings, and effectiveness of its graduates (NCATE, 1986).

Precondition 6. requires an institution to assesses the basic skills of its candidates. The precondition states:

> The unit assess the basic skills of teacher candidates using standardized test and other appropriate measures prior to admission to the program (NCATE, 1986).

Similar evaluation activities are required as a part of the Standards that must be met by an institution seeking accreditation.

The requirements of NCATE and other accreditating and approval bodies have been given further credence. For example in Tennessee, the State Advisory Council on Teacher Education and Certification will present a document to the State Board of Education, in the near future, proposing that approval of teacher education programs in Tennessee be based on the NCATE Standards or state approvals derived from NCATE. At least nine other states have already made similar decisions and ten states have adopted wholly or in part the standards of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). Twenty-two other states require extensive evaluations components within the process for the approval of a state program for the preparation of teachers (Ayers, 1987).

Also, regional accreditating bodies are giving more emphasis to the need for evaluation. The standards for accreditation of institutions of higher education by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools are changing. Emphasis in the new standards is upon outcomes assessment to show strengths and weaknesses in programs and must encompass more than a "mail follow-up survey" of the graduates. Again, this indicates the need for adequate evaluation models for higher education (SACS, 1987).

The following statement by Hord, Savage and Bethel (1982) is a key to the needs of institutions of higher education in meeting the need for evaluation.

> What procedures can be used for assessing the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and for obtaining data on which to base program improvement? One teacher education task force studying evaluation and program development assessed the state of the art of evaluation in teacher education as "one of conflicting research results, lack of clarity and agreement about evaluation designs, and a fragmentation of evaluation focus" (Strathe, 1982). Such evaluation of teacher preparation programs has been primarily focused on follow-up studies of graduates. The studies have examined various information about graduates including graduates' perceptions about and satisfaction with their programs, and ratings of the graduates' performance by supervising teachers, principals and others. Despite the pressure exerted by internal needs for evaluation and external mandates from the state or national level for accreditation, the state of the art has advanced little. Cooper (1980) observes that "very little of what is known about evaluation models and assessment procedures have been applied to teacher education programs. The methodologies ... are not well developed."

Efforts have been made to develop models for use in teacher education evaluation. For example the theoretical models developed by Borich, Smith, and Stufflebeam (Hord, Savage & Bethel, 1982) have promise for use in solving the problems of teacher education evaluation. However, there is a need for further work to bring these models to a state where they can be applied at institutions. Also, these models do not fully address the problems associated with evaluation of graduate level programs for the preparation of teachers nor programs for the preparation of school service personnel (e.g., principals and counselors).

Currently there are about 1,250 institutions offering programs for the preparation of teachers to enter the schools. No two programs are exactly alike. However, there are common patterns in many different programs. To meet the needs of the institutions, additional work must be carried out to translate theoretical constructs into practical models and systems that can be used in improving programs for the preparation of teachers (deVoss, 1981; Kilgore, 1981; Savage, 1981).

In 1986, the State of Tennessee established at Tennessee Technological University a Center for Teacher Education Evaluation. The purpose of the Center is to help in the process of developing and refining models and systems that can be used in the evaluation process to improve teacher education programs.

The primary focus of the Center is aimed at improving undergraduate teacher preparation programs. However, due emphasis is being given to the development and implementation of programs for the evaluation of the graduate programs for the preparation of teachers and school services personnel (e.g., counselors, principals, and superintendents). Research in this latter area has been neglected (Nelli & Nutter, 1985).

It appears that there are three distinct types of institutions that prepare teachers in the United States. These institutions include: (1) small private institutions that are frequently church related and have a total college enrollment under 2,500 (about 750 institutions); (2) regional universities and moderate size private schools usually offering work through the master's or specialist degree; and (3) large multi-purpose institutions that offer work through the doctorate.

The purpose of this symposium is to present a summary of the needs of these institutions for program evaluation assistance and help. It appears that each group is unique. The papers that follow were prepared by three individuals who have had extensive experience at each of the three types of institutions and have worked with accreditation and evaluation needs for their respective institutions. The information provided by these papers will be utilized by the staff of the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation as part of the work being done to determine the needs of institutions.

Individuals and institutions are asked to provide additional information about their needs for assistance with program evaluation. Also, individuals and institutions can obtain more information about the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation by writing to the author.

REFERENCES

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (1985). Showcase for Excellence: Developing Models to Enhance the Teaching Profession. Washington: AASCU.

Ayers, J. B. (1987). Unpublished study of Evaluation Requirements of State, Regional and National Accreditation Organizations. Cookeville, TN: Tennessee Technological University, Center for Teacher Education Evaluation.

Commission on Teacher Education Reform. (1985, December). Teacher Education Reform in Tennessee. Murfreesboro, TN: Tennessee Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

deVoss, Gary G. (1981). Groping... and coping... with contraditory program evaluation requirements. In Hord, S. M. & Adams, R. D. (Eds.). Teacher Education Program Evaluation, 1981: Theory and Practice. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hord, S. M., Savage, T. V. & Bethel, L. J. (Eds.). (1982). Toward Usable Strategies for Teacher Education Program Evaluation. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Kilgore, A. (1981). Small College Needs in Follow-up Evaluation Studies, in Hord, S. M. & Adams R. D. (Eds.). Teacher Education Program Evaluation, 1981: Theory and Practice. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

National Commission of Excellence in Education. (1983) A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1986). Standards, procedures, policies for the accreditation of professional teacher education units. Washington: NCATE.

National Institute of Education. (1984). Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of american higher education. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Nelli, E. & Nutter, N. (1985). A model for evaluating teacher education programs. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Sandefur, J. T.(1982) Teacher education's evaluation of graduates: where are we going and how do we know when we get there? In Hord, S. M., Savage, T. V. & Bethel, L. J. (Eds.). (1982). Toward Usable Strategies for Teacher Education Program Evaluation. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Savage, T. V. (1981). Teacher education program evaluation: A search for alternatives. In Hord, S. & Adams, R. D. (Eds.). (1981). Teacher Education Program Evaluation, 1981: Theory and Practice. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (1987).Resource manual institutional effectiveness. Atlanta: SACS.

Smith, N. L. (1982). Introductory guidelines for designing evaluations of teacher education programs. in Hord, S. M., Savage, T. V. & Bethel, L. J. (Eds.). (1982). Toward Usable Strategies for Teacher Education Program Evaluation. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

U. S. Department of Education. (1984). The Nation Responds. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office.

SMALL COLLEGE NEEDS FOR CONDUCTING TEACHER EDUCATION EVALUATION[1]

Paul A. Clark
Division of Professional Learning
Milligan College
Milligan College, TN 37682

Small colleges, just like middle-sized and large universities, need objective means to evaluate their programs for the preparation of teachers. The need for a description of the goals, the processes and the products of the small college teacher education program are very real. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) insisted through what was Standard 6 and now throughout Redesign (NCATE, 1986) that institutions preparing teachers monitor and evaluate the quality of their programs and their resources. This is all to often a sobering, anxiety-filled task for the small college.

I have had a personal interest in evaluation for several years. This year on sabbatical leave from Milligan College, an institution of 550 students, I am spending my time at the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation (CTEE) at Tennessee Technological University. This has allowed me to be away from my telephone, my faculty, and my students long enough to concentrate on our needs for evaluation and by those of other colleges similiar to Milligan (--not so far away that they forget about me before this sabbatical ends). The Center is concentrating on the development of a eclectic evaluation model, hopefully, that will be useful to teacher education units trying to meet the requirements of NCATE (and other accreditation agencies). The core of the model is the accreditation approach to evaluation. That approach has an extensive focus in the improvement of teacher education programs. I hope to contribute to the model which the Center is creating and especially give attention to the problems of the small college. In essence I am working as the omsbudsman for small colleges. "Come on you guys! You are way off the topic, at least the topics as seen in the 740+ of us small college workers.

Background Information

The need for more sophistication in teacher education evaluation is evident in the literature. It was pointed out in a number of publications, such as Involvement in Learning:

[1]The work reported herein was supported in part by a grant to Tennessee Technological University through the Centers of Excellence Program from the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. Dr. Paul A. Clark carried out this study while associated with the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation at Tennessee Technological University.

Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education (NIE, 1984), that assessment and feedback systems are necessary for improving higher education in America. Kilgore (1981), Savage (1981), Smith (1981), Smith (1982), and Nelli and Nutter (1985) and others have described the necessity for improved evaluation systems in order to improve preparation programs for teachers.

The faculty in teacher education at Tennessee Technological University has long realized the need for program improvement by the development and establishment of a comprehensive system for evaluation. The base for the Tennessee Technological University program evaluation was built around the work of Sandefur (1970) An Illustrated Model for Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates. The major focus of the evaluation work, until 1986, was on follow-up studies of graduates and ways to improve programs based on empirical evidence (Ayers, 1986).

In 1984, the Legislature of the State of Tennessee passed the Comprehensive Education Reform Act (CERA). The legislation, authorized the establishment of Centers of Excellence, to enhance established research programs. In 1986, the CTEE was established as one of the Centers for the purpose of developing and finding ways to implement improved ways for evaluating programs for the preparation of teachers. Based on a series of conferences, workshops, and inquiries, the CTEE staff decided to focus, during 1987-88 on the development of models and materials for the evaluation of teacher education programs at small colleges. Small colleges have been defined as those institutions with total enrollments of 2,500 students or less.

Research Survey

In order to better ascertain the evaluation needs of small colleges the staff of the CTEE developed a questionnaire to be used for purposes of collecting some descriptive data on evaluative needs. This needs data were related to the variables as listed in the original proposal for the Center and to eleven items related to program evaluation that were advanced by Katz and Raths (1985).

The questionnaire (Figure 1) was designed to be completed by the department or division chairperson in education at small institutions. The respondents were asked to rate their need for information about 14 items on a scale where "G" was equivalent to for "Great Need for Assistance", an "S" for "Some Need for Assistance", and an "N" for "No Need for Assistance". They ranked the Katz and Raths variables from least important to the most important. In addition, information on institutional enrollment in teacher education, the number of faculty in teacher education, and the highest degree awarded in teacher education were collected. Also the respondents were asked to add any additional information which they felt would be of value to the Center staff.

Figure 1

Code No._____

CTEE Small College Questionnaire

Please complete the following and return to the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation, Box 5207, Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, TN 38505. Note: Only group data will be reported.

For questions 1 through 3, please provide approximate or anticipated information headcount information for the Fall of 1987.

1. Total number of students at institution:_____

2. Total number of students in Teacher Education:_____

3. Total number of faculty in Teacher Education:_____

4. Highest degree awarded in Teacher Education:_____

Please rate your perceived need for assistance with your bachelor's level programs in each of the following areas. Please circle the appropriate letter.

"G"= Great Need for Assistance "S"=Some Need for Assistance "N"=No Need for Assistance

5. Selection of candidates for admission to teacher education programs.	G	S	N
6. Evaluation of the goals of the teacher education program at my institution.	G	S	N
7. Evaluation of the teacher education program content - professional content (e.g., methods courses).	G	S	N
8. Evaluation of the teacher education program content - general education (e.g., English and Mathematics).	G	S	N
9. Evaluation of the characteristics of the faculty of the teacher education program.	G	S	N
10. Evaluation of the institutional climate	G	S	N
11. Follow-up evaluation of the graduates.	G	S	N
12. Outcomes assessment of the graduates at the point of exit from the teacher education program.	G	S	N
13. Evaluation of the administrative structure for carrying out the teacher education programs.	G	S	N
14. Evaluation of the resources available to the teacher education program (e.g., equipment, materials, number of faculty, physical, and monetary).	G	S	N
15. Evaluation of the requirements for graduation.	G	S	N
16. Development of an on-going evaluation system.	G	S	N
17. Evaluation of the institution's impact on its setting and broadly in professional education.	G	S	N
18. Evaluation of program process and outcomes variables.	G	S	N

Please rate the importance to a teacher education program of the following eleven variables advanced by Katz and Raths ("A Framework for Research on Teacher Education Programs") Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (6):9-15, 1985). Place the number 1 by the most important; the number 2 by the next most important, etc. until you have ranked all 11 items--no ties please.

_____ Goal assessment

_____ Teacher Education candidate assessment

_____ Teacher education staffing needs

_____ Teacher education program appraisal

_____ Instructional methods studies

_____ Teaching time allotment studies

_____ Institutional climate studies

_____ Regulation and procedural studies

_____ Resources analysis

_____ On-going evaluation systems

_____ Impact of teacher education programs

Please add any additional information that you feel would be of value to the Center staff relative to your evaluation needs.

If you would like to have your name added to our mailing lists to receive Center announcements and our Newsletter, please complete the following:

Name:_____

Address:_____

_____

_____

City State Zip Code

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.
Please return in the Business Reply Envelope.

In order to compile a list of small colleges to receive the questionnaire the Center staff used the 1985-86 Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education (Harris, 1986) includes a listing of all institutions of postsecondary education, by state, that are accredited. All institutions listed in the document that had total enrollments of under 2,500 students and appeared to offer a program leading to at least a bachelor's degree with emphasis in some area of teacher education were chosen for inclusion in the study. The initial list included over 793 colleges. The Chair of the Department or Division of Education at each institution was mailed a copy of the questionnaire and a business reply envelope. One month after the first mailing a second was made to all non-respondents. A third mailing was made after an additional month. After two mailings (the third is still in progress) 385 usable returns had been received. However, it was also learned that 53 institutions in the original mailings did not have a teacher education program, had dropped their teacher education programs, or the institution was no longer in operation. Based on the net mailing of 740, the return of 385 represented a response of 52%. It should be pointed out that the size of the teacher education program was not a concern in this phase of the study.

Results

Although the study will be continued in order to increase the return rate it is felt the initial results that are reported will be of interest and use in making decisions about the needs of small colleges for assitance in meeting their needs for evauation assistance.

As was noted earlier, the respondents were invited to provide "open ended comments." The following provides some insight into the types of evaluative assistance that small institutions appear to need. These include direct evaluative statements such as "NCATE badly needs a good model for evaluating excellent small college teacher education programs" and "what you are doing is important." There were some concerns about making the evaluation process manageable. These statements included "Watch the costs of evaluation", and "We are concerned about not having time for Evaluation." Some were concerned about the reporting of their data to controlling organizations including, "We have a concern about excessive regulations," and "There should be an assessment of recent state and national mandates." Requests for help on the following topics were written: scope and sequence in elementary and secondary education, resources, culture and setting of the small liberal arts college, some help in attracting suitable candidates, the follow-up, long range planning, and effectiveness of graduates as change agents. Some were just cries for help, such as "Where can I get help with my G's (Great Need Rating) on this paper" and, "We want a copy of your evaluation model."

A summary of the responses to the first set of questions (5-

18) designed to identify the needs of small colleges for teacher education evaluation is given in Table 1. The Colleges expressed greatest need for help in developing a follow-up program. Over 45% of the institutional respondents marked the statement "Great Need", and an additional 32.2% expressed at least some need for help with this part of their evaluation program. Related to follow-up is the development of an on-going evaluation system. Almost 24% of the colleges marked this item "Great Need" and a total of 82.5% wanted at least some help in developing a continuing evaluation system. Other needs expressed were program process and outcomes - 80.7%; outcomes and assessments - 79.1%s; institutional impact - 77.1%.

Table 2 shows the average rank of the 11 variables of a teacher education program and the frequency the respondents indicated for each. They placed the greatest importance on program appraisal. Small colleges are concerned about collecting objective data related to their curricula including the general and professional knowledge components and practicum experiences.

Ranked number two was goal assessment which perhaps involves both, some assessment of the worth of the goal itself and an evaluation of how well the goal is being attained. Also important were: candidate assessment, program impact, and development of an ongoing evaluation system. Follow-up, which appeared to be most important in the first set of questions was not specifically included in this second list. Follow-up evaluation is suggested in several of the items that were ranked high.

Other data were collected as a part of the study. After the close off of the third mailing the analyses will be repeated. In those analyses subgrouping will be made based on selected variables. For example, the data can be divided based on the size of the faculty at an institution. Other questions can be posed such as "Are needs related to the size of the staff to conduct various phases of the evaluation process?" "Are there institutions in various areas of the country which may have specific similar needs based on regional and/or state mandated accreditation or evaluation requirements?" "What are the differences in evaluation needs between small institutions that have master's or five year programs and institutions that have only bachelor's programs?

Conclusions

A comparison of the two parts of the instrument yields a list of concerns which small colleges have in teacher education evaluation. These concerns in the order they were ranked were follow-up, ongoing evaluation system, goal assessment, candidate assessment, program appraisal, and program impact. This description of small college evaluation needs will be most useful to the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation at Tennessee Technological University in its search for tools, techniques and approaches for Teacher Education Evaluation and to assist

TABLE 1

Rating of Small Colleges Need for Assistance In Teacher Education Evaluation

Question #	Topic	G*		S*		N*	
		Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent	Freg.	Percent
5	Candidate Selection	24	6.4	158	42.1	193	51.5
6	Goal Evaluation	46	12.3	173	46.4	154	41.3
7	Program Content Professional	63	16.8	209	55.6	104	27.7
8	Program Content General	61	16.3	187	50.0	126	33.7
9	Faculty Characteristics	31	8.2	160	42.6	185	49.2
10	Institutional Climate	60	16.1	170	45.6	143	38.3
11	Follow-up Evaluation	169	45.1	139	37.1	67	17.9
12	Exit Assessment	133	35.3	165	43.8	79	21.0
13	Administrative Structure	48	12.8	183	48.7	145	39.6
14	Resources Available	93	24.7	188	49.9	96	25.5
15	Graduation Requirements	14	3.7	109	28.9	254	67.4
16	On-Going Evaluation System	90	23.9	221	58.6	66	17.5
17	Institutional Impact	76	20.9	204	56.2	83	22.9
18	Process and Outcome Variables	75	20.2	225	60.5	72	19.4

*G = Great need for assistance *S = Some Need for Assistance *N = No need for assistance

Table 2

Ranking of Eleven Variables as to their Importance

in Evaluating a Teacher Education Program

Rank Order	Question #	Topic	Average Rank	Frequency of Being Ranked First	
				N	Percent
1st	22	Program Appraisal	3.56	73	20.3
2nd	19	Goal Assessment	3.93	94	26.2
3rd	20	Candidate Assessment	4.95	52	14.5
4th	28	On-Going Systems	5.09	40	11.1
5th	29	Program Impact	5.54	41	11.4
6th	23	Instructional Methods	5.58	10	2.8
7th	21	Staffing Needs	6.04	22	6.1
8th	27	Resources Analysis	7.30	4	1.1
9th	25	Instructional Climate	7.58	11	3.1
10th	24	Teaching Time Allotment	8.16	8	2.2
11th	26	Regulation and Procedures	8.22	3	.8

colleges in their decision making regarding planning for change and improvement.

Post-Script

The staff of the CTEE invites comments about this paper. It is meant to be a preliminary report of a study that will hopefully help meet the needs of small institutions for assistance in meeting their needs for help in program evaluation and improvement. These institutions serve a very important need in our society.

References

Ayers, J. B. (1986). Proposal for the establishment of a center of excellence in teacher education evaluation at Tennessee Technological University (Revised). Cookeville, TN: Tennessee Technological University, College of Education.

Harris, S. S. (Ed.). (1986). 1985-86 Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education. Washington: American Council on Education.

Katz, L. & Raths, J. (1985). A framework for research on teacher education programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 36, 9-15.

Kilgore, A. (1981). Small college needs in follow-up evaluation studies. In Hord, S. & Adams, R. (Eds.), Teacher Education Program Evaluations, 1981: Theory and Practice. Austin, TX: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1986). Standards, procedures, policies for the accreditation of professional teacher education units. Washington: NCATE.

National Institute of Education, (1984). Involvement in learning: realizing the potential of American Higher Education. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Nelli, E. & Nutter, N. (1985). A model for evaluating teacher education programs. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Sandefur, J. T. (1970). An illustrated model for the evaluation of teacher education graduates. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Savage, T. (1981). Teacher education program evaluation: a search for alternatives. In Hord, S. & Adams, R. (Eds.). Teacher Education Program Evaluation, 1981: Theory and Practice. Austin, TX: Univesity of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Smith, N. (1981). New perspectives in evaluation: metaphors for evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Smith, N. (1982). Introductory guidelines for designing evaluations of teacher education programs. In Hord, S., Savage, T., & Bethel, L. (Eds.). Toward Usuable Strategies for Teacher Education Program Evaluation. Austin, TX: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

REGIONAL UNIVERSITIES' NEEDS FOR CONDUCTING TEACHER EDUCATION EVALUATION: A CASE STUDY OF EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY[1]

J. Linward Doak
College of Education
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, KY 40475

All institutions regardless of size must evaluate their teacher education programs. This has been a requirement for NCATE accreditation for several years. Regional institutions are placed in a unique position due to size and university support. Small colleges having few faculty have more faculty communication, less need for administrative regulations, and fewer programs, which makes evaluation much easier than evaluation at large institutions. On the other hand, major universities have many programs and a large faculty, but also have the administrative and financial resources to operate an effective evaluation program. Regional universities have many programs, large faculties, and small budgets.

Many regional universities grew out of normal schools and state teacher colleges but spend most of their time denying the role teacher education continues to play in the institution and emphasize other unique programs. For many years it has been the large education classes, both undergraduate and graduate, that financed the smaller classes in other areas of the institution. Teacher education has generally been accepted as a necessary part to de-emphasize and deny. Teacher education programs have been considered low cost programs and academically unsound. Added to this historical perspective, in recent years enrollment in teacher education programs has declined sharply due to an over-supply of teachers.

It is from this background that evaluation appears, and funds are needed to effectively evaluate programs. The program evaluation needs are the same as major universities, but fewer funds are available in most cases.

It would seem with the many programs in a regional university, a comprehensive evaluation system and follow-up of graduates is needed to provide a broad data base for teacher education from admission to the college until graduation. This central data base must be supported by all program areas. The key to success in evaluation is to get all parties involved to support the program. Faculty must be involved and accept program evaluation rather than fight it mistakenly as faculty evaluation. Faculty evaluation occurs in promotion, tenure, merit pay, and course evaluation by students. It is best to keep this separate and apart from program evaluation. If you want to keep faculty involved, they

---

[1]Presented in part before the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile, Alabama, November 1987.

must see the results of data collected and be involved in any changes made in the programs.

Some departments will not want to cooperate in a central evaluation office, but will want to keep evaluation in their own domain. This may relate to power or to the reluctance to have their programs evaluated. Evaluation must have the strong and active support of the administration from the head of the teacher education unit down to the newest faculty member. The Federal government knew this when it formulated and funded the Dean's Grants in Special Education. They knew if the head of the unit was involved and strongly supported the program, the greater the chance of positive results.

Long range planning with a comprehensive plan is needed. Faculty should be included in the planning process. Outside consultants can be of help in objectively evaluating the process and to make useful unbiased recommendations. Good programs do not appear but are the result of planning and continual revision for improvement.

Unless faculty and all units concerned are involved, the feedback from the evaluation will not result in program changes. Evaluation is the process, but the result must be used to formulate more effective programs. There are many good beginnings in evaluation, but the continual revision and feedback to departments and faculty coupled with their action is needed.

During the year 1977-78, the plan for a comprehensive evaluation program was placed into operation. Each program area prepared multiple choice comprehensive examinations in addition to a general generic test. The National Teacher Examinations was first given in the spring of 1978 only for program evaluation and has continued to be given, but it is now a requirement for Kentucky teacher certification.

Beginning with the fall of 1977, a coordinator of competency examinations was appointed, and fall 1980 an office headed by the Director of Educational Research and Evaluation was formed. This office is in charge of all program evaluation and provides evaluative data.

The proposed program in 1977 differed in several ways. Prior to admission to the education program, a personality test was administered to all applicants. Also, the admission to teacher education GPA has been raised from 2.0 to 2.25 and will be raised to 2.5 effective July 1, 1989. The GPA for admission to student teaching was raised from 2.25 to 2.5 effective with the fall of 1984.

The greatest problem in the follow-up of graduates has been the lack of approval from the student for us to receive follow-up data. We originally proposed to select a sample of graduates and collect evaluations from

students, parents, supervisors, and peers, but we have not received permission for this process from the graduate. On the positive side, the Kentucky Beginning Teacher Internship program allows us to visit the classroom at least three times and to participate in four committee meetings evaluating the intern during the first year of teaching. The committee is comprised of the principal, a peer (resource teacher), and a higher education representative, and a majority vote of the committee is necessary for continued certification.

A compounding problem relates to additional programs mandated by the state moving from bilevel to trilevel certification. Until Fall 1986, students were certified for grades 1-8 or 7-12. This bilevel certification has been changed to trilevel certification for grades K-4, 5-8, and 9-12. Administrative and service certifications are also being changed to trilevel certification.

The greatest gap remaining is the problem of follow-up for graduate programs. Each masters degree recipient had a comprehensive examination either written or oral, but the follow-up of the student after graduation is difficult. In Kentucky a student may complete 60 graduate hours including the masters for an additional pay rank and many may be contacted for program evaluation as they return for this program. The problem is not in evaluating a program but to use this data to effect constructive change.

The State of Kentucky exercises stringent control over teacher education programs being quite prescriptive. Higher education faculty are used on the committees recommending these programs, but little freedom is left to the individual college or university. With the state mandates leaving little room in the program for innovation, intrauniversity program committees further restrict the formulation of teacher education programs. This, of course, is not an evaluation problem but a control problem effecting the ability to make needed corrective changes.

The following program reflects the actual evaluation process.

EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
PROGRAM EVALUATION AND FOLLOW-UP OF GRADUATES

PROGRAM COMPONENT	METHOD OF EVALUATION
1.00 Pre-University Entrance	1.11 ACT Scores used in diagnosis for remediation if necessary.
1.11 Application for Entrance to EKU	1.12 High School Graduation
2.00 Lower Division	
2.1 EDF 102 Professional Laboratory	2.11 CTBS Achievement Tests (Reading, Language, Spelling, Math). Must score at or above the 50th percentile on end of grade 12 norms before admitted to the teacher education program.
	2.12 Speech and Hearing Evaluation
2.2 EDF 202/300 Professional Orientation	
2.21 Admission to Teacher Education	2.211 GPA of 2.25, effective July 1, 1989 GPA of 2.5 will be required.
	2.212 Essay-"Why I Want To Be a Teacher"
	2.213 Four Faculty Recommendations
	2.214 Complete 12 hours of on-campus residence credit at Eastern prior to admission to the Teacher Education Program.
	2.215 No evidence of physical or psychological impairments that would preclude teaching success
	2.216 Accumulate a satisfactory record of acceptable social behavior in the University and the community at large.
3.0 Upper Division	
3.1 EDF 317 Human Development and Learning	

PROGRAM COMPONENT	METHOD OF EVALUATION
3.2 EPY 318 Learning Theories Applied to Teaching	
3.3 EPY 412 Measurement and Evaluation in the Schools. Early Ele and Middle Grades only	
3.4 SED 400 Exceptional Students in Regular Classrooms. Early Ele and Middle Grades only	
3.5 Admission to Student Teaching	3.51 Admission to the Teacher Education Program
	3.511 Completion of 150 clock hours of clinical and field experiences prior to student teaching.
	3.512 File an application during the first four weeks of the semester prior to the term in which student teaching is desired. Any application filed is evaluated and processed for approval or disapproval.
	3.513 A valid medical examination including a current tuberculosis test. Any significant deviation from normal physical and psychological well-being will be referred to a proper examining physican.
	3.514 Behavior that relates to the moral, social, and personal standards of professional competency. The student's comportment will be subject to review and appraisal by the department responsible for the student teaching recommendation and the College of Education.
	3.515 Each student applying must complete a curriculum contract and file it with the Dean, College of Education, prior to final approval for student teaching.

PROGRAM COMPONENT	METHOD OF EVALUATION
	3.516 Successfully complete all prerequisites in professional education and pre-student teaching curricula in the applicant's area as prescribed by the current catalog.
	3.517 Recommended by the student's advisor and approved by the departmental chair.
	3.518 Standing of at least 2.5 grade point average based on hours major/minor and overall program.
	3.519 A grade of not less than C in EDF 317 Human Growth and Development, EPY 318 Learning Theories Applied to Teaching, all methods courses, all special education courses for majors and SED 438 Special Education Instructional Programs.
3.6 Program Evaluation	3.61 Common Generic Competencies Exam (College)
	3.62 Specific Program Competencies Exam (Department)
	3.63 Retest of a sample (see 2.11)
	3.64 NTE required for all enrolled in teaching programs. There is a state minimum level required for certification.
3.7 Student Teaching	3.71 Student Teaching Evaluation
4.0 Teacher In-Service	
4.1 KY Beginning Teacher Internship	4.11 State Evaluation including University personnel
4.2 Product Evaluation	4.21 Follow-up questionnaire to all graduates of undergraduate teaching programs to be sent in February or March following graduation.
	4.22 Sample follow-up during third year after graduation

PROGRAM COMPONENT	METHOD OF EVALUATION
5.0 Masters Degree	
5.1 Admission to the Graduate School	5.11 Completion of a baccalaureate degree from an accredited four year institution.
	5.12 Undergraduate GPA of 2.4
	5.13 GRE
5.2 Admission to Candidacy	5.21 GPA of minimum of 3.0
	5.22 Recommendation from Departmental Admissions Committee
5.3 Program Evaluation	5.31 Common Generic Competency Exam (Standardized College)
	5.32 Specific Program Competency Exam (Department)
	5.33 Comprehensive Exam (Current Reg.)
5.4 Product Evaluation	5.41 Follow-up questionnaire to all graduates
	5.42 Evaluative seminars held every other year
6.0 Specialist Degrees	
6.1 Admission to Graduate School	6.11 Completion of masters degree from an accredited college or university
	6.12 GRE at required level, 2.5 UGPA
6.2 Admission to Candidacy	6.2 GPA of 3.3 or above on all work toward the Ed.S.
6.3 Specialist Project	6.3 Oral examination and defense of project
6.4 Program Evaluation	6.41 Common Generic Competency Exam
	6.42 Specific Program Competency Exam
6.5 Product Evaluation	6.51 Follow-up questionnaire for all graduates

A Need for and the Role of Research Bureaus in Conducting Teacher Education Evaluation at Large Universities[1]

Arnold J. Moore
College of Education
Mississippi State University
State College, MS 39762

[1]Presented in part before the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile Alabama, November, 1987.

A NEED FOR AND THE ROLE OF RESEARCH BUREAUS IN CONDUCTING TEACHER EDUCATION EVALUATIONS AT LARGE UNIVERSITIES

Introduction

The mission of the Bureau of Educational Research and Evaluation is compatible with and complementary to those research portions of the mission statements of the College of Education and of its parent entity, Mississippi State University. Since 1904, when the first courses for teachers were offered, teacher education has been an important function of Mississippi State University. As a Land Grant institution, the University has increasingly fulfilled its responsibility to provide schools with competent teachers and service its membership. The mission of the College of Education has been to assist the University in accomplishing these responsibilities. More recently, increased activities in research and service within the College of Education have provided better visibility for its programs in these areas.

The faculty of the College of Education is committed to performing three major functions: (1) providing professional preparation for teachers, administrators, and school service personnel at undergraduate and graduate levels of instruction; (2) collaborating with school personnel, educational agencies, professional groups, and others interested in the evaluation and improvement of educational opportunities, programs and services; and (3) promoting and conducting experimental and other research studies in education to improve educational practice and to advance the theory in various educational disciplines.

The research function of the College of Education is fulfilled by both individual faculty members and special units within the College. First, investigative activities of individual faculty members as they conduct their own studies and supervise the thesis and dissertation studies of advanced graduate students provide new information relative to the disciplinary interests of the individual investigators. In addition, the College of Education currently has three agencies that perform research functions, namely, the Bureau of Educational Research and Evaluation (BERE), the Research and Curriculum Unit for Vocational and Technical Education (R/CU), and the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center for Blindness and Low Vision (RTC). Staff members from these units perform basic research functions by assisting public schools in developing, implementing, and evaluating programs of instruction. In addition, these supportive units provide technical expertise to faculty and graduate students in the areas of research design, instrument construction, and analysis of data. Members of these units also conduct research studies funded by such external agencies as the National Institute for Education, the United States Department of Education and the Mississippi State Department of Education.

Service and research functions of the College are also fulfilled through the efforts of individual faculty members and through the activities of special units within the College. The Program of Research and Evaluation for Public Schools, Inc. (PREPS) began in 1975 when seven school districts in concert with the MSU College of Education established a cooperative relationship for providing technical assistance. The College of Education, through the BERE, formed a consortium with more than 30 public school systems in the state to conduct research and evaluation studies of both ongoing and innovative programs.

From the beginning, PREPS functioned as a service and research organization to its membership. In reality, it is a shared partnership. The initial emphasis of PREPS was to conduct, with local districts, research and evaluation for decision making. For the first eight years, over 100 such projects were completed--many leading to board-level decisions at the LEA and to shared knowledge with other districts. Concurrently, PREPS staff offered training opportunities on a wide range of research and development topics to PREPS districts. Other special purpose functions such as the Research Sharing Conference evolved into the state Testing Conference now a cooperative effort with the State Department of Education. In 1983, PREPS began the test item bank as an outgrowth of the state AIM efforts. TIB is a unique program to assist member districts and their teachers in instructional accountability. PREPS continues to be a program on the leading edge of Mississippi education.

The Test Item Bank (TIB) provides sound test items which save valuable time so that teachers have more time to teach. A microcomputer-based system operating on MS-DOS machines, the TIB covers all basic subjects K-12 and produces a ready to print criterion-referenced test. Tests are based on instructional objectives designated by the user and are appropriate for a unit or a semester. Not only is it easy to use, but the items are also field tested and undergo quality assurance of content validity, reliability, and sensitivity to instruction.

The R/CU, through cooperation with the State Department of Education, has assisted school systems in developing, implementing and evaluating programs in vocational/technical education during the past ten years. The R/CU also delivers an important service to business and industry by developing curriculum models and structuring instructional systems for preparing manpower to assume jobs in critical-needs areas.

The RTC was established in 1981 at Mississippi State University. The Center is cooperatively sponsored by the National Institute on

Handicapped Research and the COE with an annual budget of $750,000.

The RTC is dedicated to the study of blindness and low vision, and their effects on the employment and career of people who are blind or severely visually impaired. The programs of the RTC are based on the two following assumptions.

1. All visually-impaired people have a right to work at a wage comparable with non-disabled persons and in careers which provide satisfaction and opportunity for advancement.

2. Many more visually-impaired persons may obtain satisfying gainful employment through the utilization of research and development programs.

The research and development programs of the RTC strive to develop products which may be used by consumers and professionals to enhance the career development of blind and visually impaired persons.

The Mississippi Writing/Thinking Consortium is composed of five state universities that are developing materials and strategies to prepare teachers of all disciplines in how to improve the writing and thinking skills of students. The Consortium cooperates with the universities, the State Department of Education, and local school districts to establish a state-wide program to perform these activities and undertake research projects.

General Objectives/Research

General objectives for research activities in the College of Education are as follows:

1. To secure more visibility for research activities in the College of Education by working to increase faculty publications and presentation of papers to professional groups.

2. To foster increased research activities among faculty and staff members by:

   a. providing technical assistance for faculty in areas of research design and data analysis;

   b. assisting staff members in the development of proposals to be submitted for external funding, and

   c. holding seminars for exchange of research findings among faculty, administrators and graduate students.

3. To develop research studies jointly with public schools which provide data for program evaluation and development.

4. To improve the quality of graduate students' research by:

   a. developing research activities for students prior to their dissertation studies,

   b. coordinating research activities of students more closely with programs in existing research units, and

   c. giving increased emphasis to students' mastery skills in computer usage and data analysis.

5. To coordinate evaluative studies which provide data for decision-making functions within the College of Education.

An Evaluation Study

Herbert M. Handley, senior researcher, BERE, was the director of an extensive evaluation study to evaluate the program in teacher education at the Master's Degree level in the College of Education at Mississippi State University, including job situations, classroom performance of graduates completing the degree, graduates' perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of their program of studies at MSU.

To accomplish this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What is the current employment status of Master's Degree recipients?
2. How satisfied are graduates with their professional performance after graduation and with their program of studies at MSU?
3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Master's Degree level graduate programs in the College of Education?
4. As viewed by supervisors, how effective are MSU graduates in job performance?
5. What recommendations are made to improve the quality of graduate teacher education programs at MSU?

The design of this evaluation was basically a descriptive one of Master's Degree graduates who successfully completed their courses of study from May, 1979, to May, 1984. Data were collected through classroom observations, interviews, and a mail survey.

The sample for the detailed study consisted of representatives from all degree programs except music education. The number included in the sample from each group was chosen proportional to the number of graduates in each program, except that all programs had at least one representative in this phase of the study. The representative sample included graduates from the following areas: educational leadership (4), elementary education (4), guidance (2), educational psychology (2), secondary education (6), physical education (2), special education (2), and, from vocational education (4).

Four strategies/measurement devices were employed for data collection. They consisted of a Follow-Up Study Questionnaire, the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire, the Interview Inventory and the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument. The Follow-Up Study Questionnaire and the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire were mailed to the graduates during the fall of 1984. Data were collected by use of the Interview Inventory and the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument during the spring of 1985 when the select sample was visited by the observers.

At the time of the survey (spring, 1985) the majority of the group held positions for which they were trained in their graduate programs. The major exception appeared to be for those trained in administration who had not yet secured positions in that area. Nearly 40% of the group studied stated that they had advanced professionally as a result of their additional study.

Eighty-five percent of the alumni surveyed were satisfied with their overall pattern of educational employment after graduation. Only three percent were very dissatisfied with their jobs.

All of the teachers interviewed felt positive about their educational experiences at MSU and, though expressing additional education needs that had not been met by their studies, reported having more confidence in their professional performance after completion of their studies than they had held previously. The majority reported a better understanding of educational issues, their roots and implications, as related to current job performance.

The group as a whole, ranked close to the 50th percentile or national average on morale as measured by the Purdue Teacher Inventory. They expressed greater job dissatisfaction regarding the curriculum of their schools. The efficacy of school programs for meeting the needs of students was questioned.

Nearly 90% of the Master's Degree graduates were satisfied with their programs of study at MSU. Nearly all persons interviewed mentioned specific ways in which their professional performance had benefited from their advanced studies. Only 2.4% of the group were very dissatisfied with their program at MSU. Four-fifths of the graduates would recommend that a friend with similar educational goals attend Mississippi State to earn the Master's Degree.

The major strength cited by graduates was the faculty. Over one-half of the subjects marked faculty competence, availability of faculty and faculty-student relationships as major program assets. The availability of a wide range of curriculum offerings was another

recognized strength. Graduates from different programs cited different program strengths. Counselors mentioned program strengths in areas of career guidance and group counseling. Educational psychologists cited their superior training for conducting psychoeducational evaluations. Program strengths in early childhood education were recognized by elementary teachers. Improvement in subject area competencies (math, science, foreign languages) was claimed by secondary majors as a program strength. Teachers in special education recognized the general excellence of their training for working with emotionally disturbed children, as well as in specific training in managing classroom behavior through reinforcement strategies. Vocational educators cited training in the areas of testing and program evaluation as program strengths. Classroom observers reported that 93% of the teachers performed adequately enough on the 16 competencies observed to be certified at the initial level but few rated at the level expected of Master teachers.

Relatively weak areas in programs for Master's Degrees as reported by graduates were: (1) Placing too much emphasis on theoretical, rather than practical, learning (cited as "weakness" by 58.7% of the group); (2) not placing enough emphasis on test construction and program evaluation; (3) lack of field experiences, practicums and "hands-on" activities in both quantity and quality dimensions; (4) lack of assistance in job placement; (5) inadequate training for handling discipline and time management problems; (6) too little assistance given in planning to improve student motivation; (7) no training given for supervising student teachers effectively, and (8) lack of concern for people after they graduate.

Supervisors in interviews reported that 52% of the 21 teachers studied in the intensive part of these evaluation activities, as compared to their counterparts with similar training and experience, ranked in the top five percent on teaching performance. All but two teachers were rated in the upper quarter (above 75th percentile). One of these teachers was "average" and one teacher was below average (lower 25%). These data suggest that MSU teaching alumni were generally highly regarded for their work performance. A small portion of the teachers, however, may be inadequately prepared to do the work expected. Three supervisors suggested that admission requirements might be strengthened, specifically relative to oral and written communication skills.

[1]Handley, Herbert M. July, 1985. Follow-up Studies of Graduates from Master's Degree Programs in the College of Education, 1979-84: Reflections of Accomplishments and Needed Changes in Teacher Education. Monograph.

INSTITUTIONAL NEEDS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

MSERA

Mobile, Alabama

November 1987

SUMMARY ITEMS: Referenced by Dr. William J. Gephart, CTEE, Tennessee Technological University

1) Evaluation of teacher education programs need to be evaluated. That's taken as matter of faith, not something soundly based on empirical data other than the abundance of "we ought to be X, Y, and Z ing." (The cardinal sin of academia).

2) Okay, that's the reason for being.

3) Given that base, what practical help can we be that will amplify the "matter of faith."

4) How can we strengthen the professional field experiences? (Develop a cadre of skilled teacher observers?)

5) Design parallel teacher education evaluation programs: one, formative; the other, summative.

6) Develop these two as the elements of The ACCREDITATION PLUS Model, and develop practical applications of A-PLUS.